

surplus war plants and other surplus property.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I heard the Senator make reference to steel plants. If I recall correctly, the Defense Plant Corporation constructed a large steel plant in the Senator's State, and I have heard that such high freight rates were established from that steel plant to the places where the steel might be used as to make the plant itself impracticable under the present freight rates. Can the Senator tell us anything about that, whether it is a fact or not, that almost exorbitant freight rates are charged on the products of this steel plant?

Mr. MURDOCK. I would not say they are exorbitant, but they are too high. They should be reduced, and the Congress of the United States should see that they are reduced, so that a great industrial plant out there, a great industrial unit, around which the entire heavy industry of the Pacific coast can be built and function in the postwar period, is disposed of while it is a going concern, and that it is disposed of under the legislation we have written on the statute books of this country.

Mr. AIKEN. Is my understanding correct that unless the freight rates were reduced the plant would have difficulty in competing with plants owned by companies in the eastern section of the country?

Mr. MURDOCK. I think that without any question the freight rates must be reduced. I do not mean by that that the plant cannot compete even under present freight rates, but it is my opinion that fairness and equity in freight rates demand that there be a reduction, a reduction to make the rates consistent with the freight rates throughout the entire country, so that the plan, so far as freight rates are concerned, will be placed on a competitive basis with eastern plants.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know why such high freight rates were fixed on the products of that plant?

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not think the freight rates have been specifically imposed on the products of this plant, I believe they were the rates which have prevailed over a long period of time; but I am satisfied that the railroads will eventually put the rates on an equitable basis with other rates throughout the country.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I should like to submit a parliamentary inquiry. I understand the Senators are discussing Senate resolution 129.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. It is my understanding that that resolution was reported only this morning, and in the ordinary course, under the rules of the Senate, it would go over. How does it come before the Senate at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is before the Senate by unanimous consent.

Mr. WHITE. Was unanimous consent asked and given?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not as to this particular resolution.

Mr. WHITE. That is what I want to know.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There were five or six resolutions presented, and the others were adopted without objection. I think the Chair ruled that this would be open to objection.

Mr. WHITE. Was unanimous consent given for the present consideration of Senate resolution 129?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not as to this particular resolution. Therefore it would be open to objection.

Mr. WHITE. I should like to know what has become of the appropriation bill that is supposed to be before the Senate? Has that been laid aside?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was not. The Chair will state what happened with reference to it. The Senator from Mississippi had the floor, and he yielded to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] for the specific purpose of reporting some resolutions, with the understanding that he would not lose the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think it is so important that we should continue to work upon and reach a conclusion with respect to the pending appropriation measure that I shall object to any unanimous-consent request for consideration of other matters. I object to the consideration of the resolution at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the Senator's objection, the resolution will go to the calendar.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I trust that no objection will be made now which will take my colleague off the floor.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I have no objection to being taken off the floor. I think it is highly important that the Senate continue with the appropriation bill now before it, instead of being detoured into consideration of an appropriation for a special committee to conduct a special investigation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will go to the calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 937. An act to amend the act suspending until June 30, 1945, the running of the statute of limitations applicable to violations of the antitrust laws, so as to continue such suspension until June 30, 1946; and

S. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution to transfer to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the functions, powers, duties, and records of certain corporations.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 184) to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 937. An act to amend the act suspending until June 30, 1945, the running of the statute of limitations applicable to violations of the antitrust laws, so as to continue such suspension until June 30, 1946;

H. R. 3035. An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes.

WAR AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3368) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] has the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BILBO. For what purposes, may I ask?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, without taking the Senator from Mississippi from the floor, and without interfering in any way with his present status, I ask unanimous consent that the pending bill be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3550 making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator state again the nature of the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is the bill making appropriations for the Military Establishment, and if it is not passed by Saturday night there will be no money at all to support the military.

Mr. WHITE. Is it the military appropriation bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. I shall not object.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Unless the bill is passed by midnight Saturday, Mr. President, there will not be a penny to support the armed forces throughout the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, unless the bill we are now considering is passed by the same date, there will not be a penny for the many war agencies provided for in House bill 3368. I object for the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President I am sorry but not surprised because the Senator who objected to the request just made is planning to defeat a measure providing for 16 other agencies and why not 1 more. So I am not surprised.

Mr. President yesterday evening when the Senate recessed the Senator from New Mexico and I were sent away with the injunction from our beloved friend the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] to pray—to pray that the Lord might direct us in some way to extricate ourselves from the present complications which confront us. I do not know what my friend the Senator from New Mexico did, but I did pray. The only response I had or have is that still small voice that seems to say to me, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant. Go on and do not weary in well-doing." Therefore, I shall proceed.

I call the attention of Senators to a statement made by the National Economic Council of New York City telling us what is behind this bill:

The past year or two a wave of propaganda has demanded the enactment by Congress and the several States of so-called antidiscrimination laws.

The assumption of many persons is that these measures are a generous and timely effort that will bring contentment to all the people. But there is impressive evidence that they are, instead, merely one more attempt of the Communists to stir up trouble.

I told the Senate yesterday where this movement originated. It came from the brain of A. Philip Randolph, and Eugene Davidson, and Mayor LaGuardia, and Aubrey Williams, and it is well known what influences that crowd has been operating under.

There undoubtedly is some discrimination against many Negroes—

That, Mr. President, has been happening for 300 years, and I am wondering if those behind this movement think they are going to stop it overnight with the enactment of the kind of legislation they propose.

There is no one in the Senate who sympathizes with the Negroes more than I do. I know that for 300 years, since they have been on the American soil, they have been discriminated against. They were discriminated against sorely before Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, and since then they have been discriminated against, and they will be discriminated against for the next 500 years or 1,000 years, if permitted to live or if they decide to continue to live side by side with the white men in this country. There is only one way that the Negro can escape this discrimination, and that is by voluntarily returning to his fatherland, west Africa.

Oh, but it is said that this move is in the interest of the war effort. I have a petition signed by a number of Negroes from the South, as well as by a few quivering whites. They say that this legislation is necessary for the war effort. Why? How does it affect the war effort? Mr. Ross, the head of the organization, admits that he has no power. He admits that his 115 employees are just a bunch of happy sugar boys going out over the country dishing out lollipops. They cannot do any good. They have not done any good. They have done nothing but stir up friction, and they have been re-

sponsible for some of the worst strikes we have had in the country. I know of some of the disturbances they have brought about in the South, and I shall read about them to the Senate later. Instead of helping the war effort they have injured the war effort.

It is said that the enactment of the proposed legislation will give us more labor to manufacture more machinery, munitions, and tools of death. Mr. President, there has been no shortage anywhere of labor to carry on except recently we had a shortage of shipbuilders on the Pacific coast, and that was brought about by reason of the idea that was entertained prematurely that the war was about over, and a number of workers went back to their old jobs to obtain employment which was more or less permanent. But even that situation has been resolved.

Today in Detroit and in Chicago strikes are in progress. There is an abundance of labor. There is no shortage of labor in any of the essential industries of the country engaged in making the materials necessary to complete the job in which we are engaged in the South Pacific and in Japan.

There is undoubtedly some discrimination against many Negroes and to a certain extent against many Jews.

That is natural, that is true, and it will continue to be true on and on, regardless of any fool communistic concept of legislation such as the FEPC.

But such discrimination is in large part merely the expression by the 117,000,000 non-Negroes and non-Jews of their choice of employees or fellow employees, or companions or associates. Such choice is, in the very nature of things, a part of liberty itself.

Let me read that again:

But such discrimination is in large part merely the expression by the 117,000,000 non-Negroes and non-Jews of their choice of employees or fellow employees, or companions or associates. Such choice is, in the very nature of things, a part of liberty itself.

Is any Member of this body so foolish as to think that we can legislate and control the tastes, appetites, wishes, and preferences of the people? It is a fool proposition. Under the terms of the bill sponsored in the House by Mrs. Norton, the powers are so far reaching that if the bill were passed, enforcement agents would come up to Capitol Hill and make the rounds of the Senate Office Building. They might come into some Senator's office and say, "You are violating the anti-discrimination law. You have no one employed in your office except white persons. You are discriminating against Negroes. You do not employ any Jews. You are discriminating against Jews. You had better get a colored girl for a stenographer, and you had better slip in a few Jews, too, or you will suffer the pains and penalties of the law, even if you are a Senator." Senators are supposed to obey the laws they make.

You may pass this fool law if you so desire, and you may attempt such an enforcement as I have outlined; but if such enforcement is undertaken, I do not be-

lieve there will be found to be as many law-abiding Senators as one might think.

Negroes and Jews in the United States have had greater opportunities than in any other country on earth.

Let that sink in.

Negroes and Jews in the United States have had greater opportunities than in any other country on earth. On the day the New York legislative committees held a hearing on an antidiscrimination bill the New York papers carried long articles telling of the election of a Negro as president of the Bar Association of Dutchess County, N. Y., and mentioning incidentally that his daughter is a justice of the domestic relations court in New York City.

Since I have been a Member of the Senate we have confirmed the nominations of many members of the Federal judiciary who were Negroes; yet we talk about discrimination. They are receiving great consideration in this country.

But that is not what this measure is intended to do. It is not intended to do away with discrimination. It is a smooth deliberate plan and scheme to integrate the Negro race into the life of the American laboring world. It is one step in the great drive for social equality, social commingling, social intermingling, intermarriage—interbreeding, if you please.

It is said that there is a noted Negro church in this city in which no Negro is welcome as a member of that flock if he is coal-black. He must be a "high brown" to be welcome as a member. That shows the dream and the scheme behind it all.

Increasing numbers of Negroes are constantly attaining distinction in many fields. There is less reason now for antidiscrimination laws than there might have been 10, 20, or 30 years ago.

I wonder why somebody did not think about this damn-fool law in the First World War. The Communists had not yet obtained control of this country. Their influence was not strong during the other war, and no one thought about it.

The situation has been steadily improving in that slow but sure way which is the soundest way of all, but which apparently annoys the zealots and fanatics who wish to see any situation they think wrong righted overnight.

As I told the Newspaper Guild the other day in a telegram, if they continue trying to promote these fool communistic concepts and crank ideas through Congress, the American people will become fed up with it, there will be a revolution, and we will liquidate the whole damnable crowd.

And many good citizens, who have lacked opportunity really to study the matter, are today being misled by these very fanatics, and by an alien-minded element with aims and purposes of its own.

It would be interesting to examine the pay rolls of some of the New Deal bureaus, including the FEPC, and determine the genealogy of the employees on the pay roll, and where they come from. We could then understand why it is a

fertile field for such alien ideas and concepts.

Most Americans regret the existence of any discrimination.

I think that is true. I do not like to see the Negro discriminated against. But when I say that I think the Negro ought to be segregated, Judge Hastie, Roy Wilkins, Dr. DuBois, and many of the white quislings say that segregation is discrimination. They lie. It is not. Segregation is a natural law. It is the natural way of doing things. We practice segregation in connection with many things. On the floor of the Senate we segregate Senators. We make the Republicans sit over yonder, and the Democrats over here. Are we discriminating? According to Judge Hastie, Roy Wilkins, Dr. DuBois, and all the intelligent Negroes and their newspapers, that is discrimination. Are we discriminating against Republicans, or are the Republicans discriminating against the Democrats? Inasmuch as the Democrats are in the majority and in control, I suppose we are guilty of discrimination, and I apologize to my friends on the opposite side of the aisle for discriminating against them because we have segregated them over on that side. But many Negroes and white quislings go crazy when we say that Negroes shall eat here and whites shall eat there. They call that discrimination. That is not discrimination. I want to see the Negroes have the best churches in the country. I want them to have good schools. I want them to have good colleges and universities. I want them to have good homes. I like to see them own their own homes and lands. I am glad to see them have their own playgrounds, ball parks, and swimming pools; but I do not want them to be messing around and puddling around in the water in my swimming pool.

Mr. President, there was a great meeting the other day in New York, for the purpose of inaugurating a campaign to compel the admission of Negro players into the major league baseball teams—the outfit which HAPPY CHANDLER is going to run. I think one of the most disgraceful things that we tolerate in American life is prize fights between Negroes and white men. I do not want to say it publicly, but I will state it as a fact, that when I see a white man go into the ring with a Negro, in a boxing contest, I am for the Negro; I want him to win every time; I want him to knock hell out of the white man. It is purely a question of physical strength, and the Negro has behind him the strength of giants in Africa for 3,000 years, and he is supposed to be strong and stout and able to knock a home run. The white man, through his culture, his education, and his training, has not put so much stress upon the physical side as he has upon the mental and moral side, for the last 3,000 years.

I now read further from the pamphlet:

True education, patience, and greater emphasis on the Christian quality of charity (that is, good will) will accelerate the improvement in race relations that has long been noted, but to resort to compulsion by

legislation is not the remedy. That will set the clock back—and will probably do worse. The eighteenth amendment proved that.

The eighteenth amendment was the one by which we tried to make the whole darn country sober overnight, by taking whisky away from the people. The thing would not work. Now we have a lot of these so-called liberals and fanatics who think they are going to revolutionize the conceptions and culture and ideals of the American gentile white man which have existed for a thousand years, and they think they will do it overnight by an act of Congress. Why, Mr. President, it is getting so that every alley rat and town rat and field rat—a lot of fanatics—will come to Washington and will say, "Let's introduce a bill in Congress." A lot of them think they have a Supreme Court which will sustain anything they want.

To the Senators who favor the campaign which now is under way, I say, "If you succeed in the campaign you are now making, I will have to meet it. I will have to fight fire with fire, and I will have to have the legislative counsel prepare a bill, which I will introduce, to prohibit the intermarriage of whites and blacks in all the States of the Union."

I think my friend the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and other Senators will vote for it. I have as much right to go to New York and tell the white people there that they should protect the integrity and blood of their race by not permitting intermarriage between the whites and the blacks, rather than to permit the destruction of both races, as they have to come to Mississippi and tell me, "You cannot have a poll tax." What is the difference?

Now they are coming down to Mississippi and are going to tell every man who is employing six or more persons that he must employ some Jews, some Catholics, some Negroes, some Poles, and some Italians. Employers will be told, "You must not discriminate; give them all a break." In other words, they are going to regulate our taste and our smell, if you please; I will put it that way.

I read further from the pamphlet:

We submit herewith an offset copy of a pamphlet published in 1935 by the Workers Library Publishers.

That is the publishing concern of the Communist Party in the United States.

I read further from the pamphlet:

A perusal of this suggests the likelihood that the antidiscrimination campaign for which many good people, including church organizations, have fallen is of wholly alien origin.

This National Economic Council of New York insists that the campaign is of alien origin, and I think the council is right about it.

By the way, there is another bill which I wish to introduce in the Congress if we are going to have a wave of fanatical legislation. I do not think Congress has any right to do it, but I think I should introduce the bill. It is along another line. I am not going to let the Negroes and whites marry anywhere in the United States, under my law. There are

19 States which permit it today. My State has a law prohibiting the intermarriage of members of the white Caucasian race with members of the Mongolian race. We do not propose to mix with the Japs or the Chinese. Yet we have a noted lady going around the country preaching the intermarriage of the Mongolians and the white Caucasians of America—Miss Pearl Buck; all of you have heard of her. That is her idea; she thinks that is one way to straighten out the Chinese question.

The other bill which I am thinking of introducing is a bill to prohibit the education of whites and blacks in the same schools. We do not permit it in the District of Columbia, and there are no States south of the Mason and Dixon's line which permit the mixing of the races in the schoolrooms. Why not pass a national law prohibiting any of the States from doing it? Certainly those who have been trying to cram these ideas down the throats of my people will not object; they will be good sports about it. If they are going to do this to me in Mississippi, then let me walk into their States and tell them that they are not going to send their children to a Negro school; they are not going to mix them; they are not going to seat a sweet little white girl of 10 or 15 years of age on a bench in a schoolroom with a young Negro boy 10 or 15 years old.

Of course, in Philadelphia, they have Negro teachers over white children. At that impressionable, tender age, Mr. President, you understand, the white children have Negro teachers standing over them and teaching them. We know how natural it is for the young child to love and admire and worship and make a hero out of the teacher, and when that child goes out into life, we know what its attitude will be; and we know how easy it is to break over the line, socially, with the result of intermarriage and interbreeding.

I read further from the pamphlet:

"The Negroes in a Soviet America," as the reader will see, is a direct incitement by the Communists to bloody revolt against the white people of the United States, urging them to set up a Soviet form of government and affiliate with Soviet Russia. The foreword on page 2 urges social equality as "a minimum desire" of the Negro.

That is urged as a minimum desire.

I read further:

On page 35 is the statement "The Negro people can find inspiration in the revolutionary attempts of Gabriel, Denmark Vesey, Nat Turner * * *" etc.; and upon consulting volume XIV of Albert Bushnell Hart's History of the American Nation, it will be found that two at least of these Negroes were the leaders in Negro revolts in which scores of white men, women, and children were mercilessly slaughtered.

I have before me a copy of the Communist document to which he refers. It will be interesting to read; Senators should read it. Perhaps they would find out something about what they are doing and what they are supporting here.

On page 38 is the statement that "any act of discrimination or of prejudice against a

Negro will become a crime under the revolutionary law?

That is what some would say now. I repeat:

Any act of discrimination or of prejudice against a Negro will become a crime under the revolutionary law.

The antidiscrimination bills carry out this idea precisely.

At the present moment, of course, the Communist technique has changed—it would not aid in securing a continuance of lend-lease or the expected help in Russian reconstruction if so crude a pamphlet were circulated now. Nevertheless, as David J. Dallin points out in his book, *The Real Soviet Russia* (published by the Yale University Press, 1945), this current attitude of the Communists is merely a phase from which the Communists will return to their ruthless Communist program when the current need has passed.

In other words, they will not be so bold. The Comintern has been adjourned for the present. Later on, as they move in step by step with their Communist ideas of government, the good old American Constitution about which we have bragged so much, with its Bill of Rights, will be no longer of any consequence. It will not satisfy some of the persons who are trying to change our educational and economical scheme of government by fool concepts of law.

We got along for 150 years, I may say to my good friend from New Mexico, without the FEPC. I think we can get along without it for a while longer.

I continue reading:

James W. Ford, one of the authors of the pamphlet has been several times the candidate of the Communist Party for Vice President. "James S. Allen," the other author, is the alias for Sol Auerbach whose activities were a matter of record before the Dies Committee.

This special offset edition of "The Negroes in a Soviet America" has been brought out in order that the people may form a true understanding of what is back of the present hullabaloo about race equality.

Mr. President, here is a copy of a document entitled "Antidiscrimination Laws and the FEPC" which was written by James W. Ford and James S. Allen. It was circulated by the Communists all over the United States in 1935. It did more to poison the minds and arouse the viciousness of the southern Negroes than anything else which had taken place within a quarter of a century. It is the origin of the FEPC. It merely represents a difference in approach.

Mr. President, much has been said about compromising this matter. I wish to read what the Southern Watchman of May 26, 1945, says about compromising on a question of this character when principles are involved. I read:

From Washington this week comes the news that efforts in the Senate Education and Labor Committee to work out "some compromise acceptable to southern Senators" on legislation for a permanent FEPC have "all but collapsed."

Is it any wonder?

A compromise by southern Senators on such an issue as this is unthinkable. Either you order employers to hire so many Negroes and so many whites, or you don't. Either you fasten Federal interference on the employer's right to hire whom he pleases, or you don't. Either you compel the industrial admixture of insoluble labor elements, or

you keep them apart. Either you control the Nation's industrial personnel practices by blanket edict from Washington, or you permit local conditions and customs to prevail. There can be no compromise.

The South got its belly full of FEPC medicine, concocted during the height of the New Deal by Executive order, back in 1942—

It was 1941—

when the present "temporary" and "emergency" agency by the name was created.

The first Executive order was in 1941, and the other Executive order was in 1942.

I continue reading:

This strife-stirring Commission conducted a notorious inquisition of southern employers in Birmingham's Federal courtroom and, using its own prosecutor to dictate the hiring practices of numerous industries which were forced to take time out from their production of vital war materials to try to maintain satisfactory, untroubled working conditions in their plants.

The proceeding was sensational in Birmingham where an attempt was being made to control the personnel lists of the industries located there.

I continue reading:

Southerners have not forgotten that a Negro member of this FEPC, sitting on the bench at the Alabama institution, declared that "Executive Order 8802 (creating the agency) supersedes the traditions of the South."

In other words, if any Senator wishes to know something about what is being done today in Congress, and wishes to know the details of it, as well as all about the other side of the question in regard to the FEPC, all he needs to do is to go to a newsstand and buy a copy of the *Africo-American*. Here is a copy of it. It has references to the FEPC scattered all over it. For example, here is one headline: "FEPC filibuster looms." The next headline is, "Byrnes unfit for Secretary of State. Statement on Negro reveals attitude."

One time when Senator Byrnes was in the Senate he said, "Neither political equality nor social equality is essential to the happiness of a Negro."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may send a resolution to the desk?

Mr. BILBO. I will be delighted to yield providing that I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. I object.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. Can an objection be made to one Senator yielding to another Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the distinguished Senator from Mississippi is willing to yield temporarily without losing the floor, an objection will lie, if made.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Chair mean that unanimous consent is required?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BILBO. I am very sorry, I may say to the Senator from Louisiana. I should like to accommodate him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BILBO. I do not wish to yield if I am to be taken off the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not wish to take the Senator off the floor.

Mr. BILBO. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana with the understanding that I retain the floor. If any Senator wishes to object, let him speak now.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator from Mississippi yields for any purpose except for being asked a question, I object to him yielding the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Senator's right.

Mr. BILBO. That is the strict application of parliamentary practice, but this morning the question was raised, and there was an understanding at that time that the rule would not be invoked then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been heard. The Senator from Mississippi will proceed on the pending measure.

Mr. BILBO. That suits me all right. [Laughter.]

You have started your monkey business before the filibuster starts. I am not filibustering; I am merely trying to educate you.

There is a new and more moderate President in office now. The trend toward left-wing reforms against an unwilling public appears to be abating. Mutual trust and cooperation between Congress and the Executive is in the air. The Senate is apparently anxious to avert a prolonged filibuster—a certain and necessary eventuality if FEPC advocates persist in forcing a show-down.

I want to read that to my friend from Mexico again:

The Senate is apparently anxious to avert a prolonged filibuster—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. BILBO. The article continues—a certain and necessary eventuality if FEPC advocates persist in forcing a showdown.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. BILBO. I have the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know the Senator has the floor, but I do not want him to be confused. If he has any friends from Mexico, I want him to say so. If he refers to me I want him to say "New Mexico."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHERRY in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BILBO. I thought the Senator was going to ask me a question, but instead of asking a question, it was just an explosion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BILBO. No; I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well. The Senator from Mississippi will proceed in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I insist to the Senator that I am from New Mexico and not from Mexico.

Mr. BILBO. I insist I know just as much about Mexico as I do about New Mexico, and I do not know a darn thing

about New Mexico, and the Senator does not know anything about Mississippi.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question only.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the Senator know where New Mexico is?

Mr. BILBO. I know a little about my country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am satisfied that "little" is correct.

Mr. BILBO. Well, with what Mexico sends over here, I have not much chance to learn much more.

The article continues:

Even Alabama's junior Senator LISTER HILL declares he cannot swallow the permanent FEPC bill. Coming from a legislator who has jumped through the left-wing hoop quite consistently for a long time, his opposition ought to discourage even the most intemperate reformer.

No, the South does not want a permanent FEPC. It doesn't want a "compromise," either. Its deep-seated feeling on this question was well expressed in the resolution of Senator Lawson, of Greensboro, which both branches of Alabama's Legislature adopted unanimously just a few days ago. That resolution roundly denounced FEPC as a disrupter of friendly and normal relationship now prevailing between the races in this State and called upon their Representatives and Senators in the Congress of the United States to bestir themselves and make sure that it and all other such Federal nostrums are kept out of this State.

If the South's Senators do their full duty, there will be no such thing as a permanent FEPC. This journal is confident that the line will be firmly held.—Alabama News Magazine.

Let them record the fact whether the South holds the line or not.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let there be order in the Senate. Senators desiring to converse will please retire to the cloakrooms, and the Chair asks the galleries, please, to cooperate in keeping order. The Senator from Mississippi will now proceed.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I desire to read the resolution referred to in the article I have just read from the Alabama News Magazine. Here is the resolution of State Senator L. J. Lawson, of Greensboro, Ala., on the establishment of a permanent FEPC as passed unanimously by both the House and Senate of Alabama:

Be it resolved by the Senate of Alabama (the house concurring), That it has been the boast of Americans that our form of government permitted local self-government, thereby making it possible for the widely separated sections of our country to live together in peace and harmony by making allowances for local conditions and situations.

That might be the reason why Alabama and Mississippi cannot get together with New Mexico, which is so far away, and where conditions are different, populations are different, and climate and soil are different.

That in Alabama there exist conditions with respect to relationship between the races

which are not general to the country as a whole, as, for instance, that in certain counties of this State the colored population very greatly exceeds in number the white population;

That the experience of this State in Reconstruction times and since has shown that no good can come from changing the normal course of evolution and development of a race by arbitrary legal means, and that such attempts lead only to violence, misunderstanding, and destruction of the normal and happy relationship now prevailing between the races in this State, and which will continue to prevail here if they are left in peace and harmony to work out their mutual problems: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we do now call upon our Representatives and Senators in the Congress of the United States, by every means within their power, to oppose the enactment of such Federal legislation as the so-called permanent fair employment practice law, the welfare of Alabama, in our opinion, demanding that they do so; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States and to the Members of Congress from Alabama.

There is a great sovereign State, through its legislative branch, calling on its representatives in Congress to do everything in their power to oppose the passage of this damnable legislative measure, upon which there could be no compromise.

I desire to read a little article which is interesting, or ought to be, to some people. It is entitled "When 'Liberals' Become Fascists"; and there is such a thing as a liberal becoming a Fascist.

WHEN "LIBERALS" BECOME FASCISTS

One of these days, our American "liberals" will discover that the essence of freedom—the real liberalism—is the right to love whom we please, to hate whom we please, and to say as much publicly, if so inclined. These "liberals" will discover that it is far more difficult to legislate effectively in behalf of love, or against hate, than for the prohibition of alcoholic beverages. When these "liberals" advocate the establishment of an iniquity such as the Fair Employment Practices Committee, they are playing hand in glove with the identical totalitarian ideas which they profess to despise. They are being Fascists, in the meanest sense of the word.

That is rather hard on the sponsors of the FEPC. I will read part of it again to my dear friend:

American "liberals" will discover that the essence of freedom—the real liberalism—is the right to love whom we please, to hate whom we please, and to say as much publicly, if so inclined. These "liberals" will discover that it is far more difficult to legislate effectively in behalf of love, or against hate, than for the prohibition of alcoholic beverages.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question.

Mr. OVERTON. Would there be any objection on the part of the Senator from Mississippi if I were to ask permission to send to the desk and to have printed a resolution which would read as follows:

Resolved, That when the United Nations Charter to maintain international peace and security, signed at San Francisco, Calif., on June 26, 1945, shall be laid before the Senate

for ratification, the injunction of secrecy shall be removed, it shall be read a first time, and the Senate shall thereupon proceed to consider the same in open executive session.

The purpose of the resolution would be that the Senate should immediately proceed to consider the Charter and ratify it without amendment or reservation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just a moment.

Mr. OVERTON. That is a question I am asking.

Mr. BILBO. I yield for the asking of a question, but not for the discussion of business, thereby taking me off the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. I am asking if there would be any objection—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi objects to the introduction of a resolution.

Mr. OVERTON. All I am asking is whether there would be any objection on the Senator's part, or on the part of any other Senator on the floor—

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I shall object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Maine for a question?

Mr. BILBO. I do not yield to anybody if it will take me off the floor. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHITE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. WHITE. I make the point of order that if the Senator from Mississippi yields for sending to the desk, for the reading, for the reporting of a resolution, or the consideration of a resolution, or any action whatsoever with respect to a resolution, the Senator from Mississippi will have forfeited his right to the floor.

Mr. BILBO. I did not yield for that purpose, and the Senator is correct in his interpretation of the parliamentary situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor. He will proceed.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question. The Senator merely asked me a question. He may ask another if he desires.

Mr. OVERTON. The question I asked was propounded not only to the Senator from Mississippi—at least it was so intended—but was propounded to all Senators who may be upon the floor, whether there would be any objection to a unanimous consent request that I may send this resolution to the desk to lie on the table.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just a moment. What is the answer of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BILBO. I object to the Senator from Louisiana asking anyone else a question but myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is sustained, and the Senator

from Mississippi will proceed on the pending matter.

Mr. BILBO. That is a strict construction of the parliamentary law, and we will stand by it. If my friends on the other side wish to become technical, we will conduct our lives accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi will proceed on the pending measure.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I wish to read a statement by a Representative from North Carolina, which has been answered by the publication which I hold in my hand. This is the answer to the question, *The White Man's Role*.

THE WHITE MAN'S ROLE

Representative ERVIN, of North Carolina, in his speech to the House last week, opposing the establishment of the FEPC on a permanent basis, pointed out that while the Negro population of America is less than 9.8 percent of the whole, the last quarterly inquiry of the FEPC shows that the Negro personnel in all of the departments and agencies of our Federal Government constitutes 19.2 percent of all the Federal departmental employees, while the Negro personnel in departmental and field work constitutes 11.9 percent of the total civilian employment of our Federal Government.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. That includes most of the charwomen, does it not, who do all the heavy work?

Mr. BILBO. It does not.

Mr. LANGER. How many of them are there in the departments?

Mr. BILBO. If the Senator will go to any of the Government departments today and walk through the large halls which the girl stenographers are using, he will find it looks like a black cloud arising.

Mr. LANGER. All the charwomen are Negroes.

Mr. BILBO. Some of the charwomen are Negroes, but some of them are white. We have had some white women working around in the Capitol. We have some porters who are white. We have some messengers who are white. But I say that in all the departments of the Government, under the New Deal down town, the Senator will find that 19.2 percent are Negroes, although they are not entitled, under this rule of discrimination, to more than 9.9 percent in employment. In other words, they have already twice as many on the job as they are entitled to, according to the pro rata of the population in the United States. Yet, they come around here bellyaching about the situation. I read further:

There are no statistics available on this score, but we do know that, by education and ability, there are far more white people capable of holding down these Federal jobs than there are Negroes, on a percentage basis. Considered on the basis, the advantage of the Negroes, already better than two to one, takes on even greater proportions.

When will some southern Congressman introduce a bill guaranteeing to the white people of this country, and especially to those of the South, equality in treatment by the Federal Government? That is the real, crying need of today in the field of fair employment practices.

I am wondering if my friend from North Dakota catches the point. Some one should introduce a bill making it obligatory on the Federal Government to see to it that these minorities which are raising so much hell are permitted to get only their pro rata share of the Federal jobs. If that were done, it would be necessary at once to dismiss half the Negroes who are on the pay roll, because they have more than half of the number to which they are entitled. That would open the way for several thousand white girls and white boys to get these good, fat Government jobs in Washington. If the desire is to do away with discrimination in this country, let us have another bill to go along as a companion to the pending bill, and we will straighten the thing out. But some do not want to straighten it out. They like for it to be crooked.

Here is a message to the southern Members of the United States Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of calling a quorum?

Mr. BILBO. I refuse to yield for the call of a quorum because it would take me off the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is correct. He may proceed.

Mr. BILBO. I read:

We support you to the hilt in the plans which we presume you are already making to filibuster as long as it takes to defeat the antisouthern bill to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee. We understand why no compromise on this radical proposal was possible in the Education and Labor Committee. Even the Senator from Florida, Mr. PEPPER, a consistent supporter of the old Roosevelt left-of-center movement, could not stomach this one. The 12 to 5 vote in committee to report it favorably was a geographical vote. The FEPC bill is an intolerable assault upon the South's patient, practical, increasingly successful treatment of its racial problem.

The advocates of this legislation are reformer-agitators from other areas who face no such concerns as we do. This bill represents dictation-from-afar at its worst. It is discriminatory, because no other section would suffer as would the South. It is dangerous, because it courts violence.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. How long does the Senator expect to speak?

Mr. BILBO. How long do I expect to speak?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. BILBO. Until the FEPC is dead.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad I understand the Senator.

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

The hard-handed sponsors of this evil scheme to force whites and Negroes to consort, regardless of sex, regardless of local custom, regardless of segregation laws, regardless of everything but the furious flirting with the northern Negro vote—these meddlers have had ample notice of your determination that this shall not come to pass.

They know they are faced with a filibuster. They have asked for it. Let them have it.

We are getting ready to do that very thing.

You will be criticized by pinkish pundits for holding up the wheels of lawmaking while

we are at war. Let that not deter you. You didn't start this fight. But we are depending upon you to be in at its finish.

Southern Senators, organize your ranks for this vital show-down. The South is squarely behind you. You know all too well that this is one thing we won't take.—Alabama News Magazine.

That statement from an Alabama newspaper states the case exactly. We are here face to face this afternoon with two bills on the calendar which ought to be passed. One contains an appropriation of \$38,000,000,000 for the war. After next Monday the Army will have no money unless the bill is passed. We also have the other bill which is now under consideration, known as the war agencies bill, which provides \$777,000,000 to support 16 war agencies. Unless the bill is passed this week, next Monday they will not have a cent to spend. That bill came from the House without any FEPC in it. There was not a line in it concerning FEPC. There was not a suggestion in it about FEPC. The bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and was reported by that committee and placed on the Senate Calendar and it is now here before us ready for passage without containing one word about FEPC, without having in it 1 cent for FEPC.

What happened, Mr. President? My good friend, the Senator from New Mexico, who has been very active since last year in this campaign—and I have before me a copy of the hearings before the subcommittee of which he was chairman—makes public announcement that he is going to make a motion to suspend the rule of the Senate in order to put into the bill which heretofore has been clean, which heretofore has had nothing to do with FEPC, which has not been tainted, which has not been touched, which is ready to be passed in 3 minutes—he insists on suspending the rule and putting in this bill this piece of poison, knowing that when he does so it will kill the bill. Not only that, Mr. President, it will result in killing all the other bills on the calendar.

I reason this way about the matter. Insistence on the motion to suspend the rule, which requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate, in order to put this damnable communistic appropriation in the bill; will result in killing the bill, for we will maintain a filibuster against it until midnight Saturday. Therefore, the Senator who makes the motion and Senators who vote to suspend the rule are responsible for the death of the bill. That is the reason I am speaking now before the filibuster starts. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I am trying to show the Senate that the FEPC is a damnable thing, that it is an unrighteous thing, that it is an unholy thing, that it is a trouble-breeding thing, that it will bring about confusion, trouble, and even bloodshed in the Nation, especially in the South. I am trying to get that over, to get that into the minds of Senators, and to let them know that we cannot stand for it and we will not stand for it. We cannot even compromise on the matter.

Mr. President, I beg Senators, I plead with them not to make such a motion. I have been trying to show them why, in the interest of our Government, they should not do it. I have been trying to show that they should not make it because it will defeat the bills which are on the calendar. Senators cannot justifiably say that we who oppose FEPC are responsible if the bills are defeated, that the filibuster has killed them, because we put other Senators on notice, and we present the Senate with a clean bill which has passed through the House, which has been reported by the Appropriations Committee and is in the Senate now ready to be passed. But other Senators try to stop the bill on its way and fill it full of poison.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. No, I have no question. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi may proceed.

Mr. BILBO. That proves that a Senator can change his mind, and I hope other Senators will.

I have before me a copy of the hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor on Senate bill 2048. I want Senators to listen to this. I read from page 122:

Statement of Prof. James H. Sheldon, chairman, New York Metropolitan Council on Fair Employment Practice, New York, N. Y.

That council is composed of the following:

New York Urban League. That is Negro.

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. That is Negro.

Greater New York CIO Council. That is either Negro or mixed.

New York Council of Church Women. Ah, that is Negro.

Loyal Americans of German Descent. That is hybrid.

City-wide Citizens Committee for Harlem. That comes from a black section. I guess it is colored too.

Federation Employment Service. I do not know what that is.

Brotherhood of Painters. I do not know what that is.

Common Council for American Unity. That sounds communistic.

Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League. That is communistic too.

Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America. I cannot say what that is.

Joint Council of Dining Car Employees of New York. I know that is black.

The YMCA, various branches; YWCA, various branches, and so on.

National Council of Jewish Women, and many other similar well-established and responsible institutions.

Those are the members of the council for whom Professor Sheldon speaks. I will not bore the Senate by reading all the testimony, but will read one sentence; that will be sufficient:

The passing of this kind of law is just as important as signing a peace treaty. We have not won the war as long as there is a residue of Hitlerism, conscious or uncon-

scious, operating in the minds of the men who run the employment offices of American industry. We might as well face the facts now that although Hitler is clearly losing the war—

He lost it since—

and losing it badly, he has nevertheless, won a certain phase of it, to the extent that he has succeeded in leaving many of the worst doctrines of Mein Kampf scattered about the minds of millions of thoughtless Americans. Democracy in this country—

Listen, Senators—

will not be safe until we have adopted the necessary devices to get rid of this last loathsome evidence of the nazism, and a permanent FEPC is one of the very first medicines to be prescribed for this purpose.

Mr. President, Professor Sheldon is a wise old boy. He knows what it is all about. He knows what he is doing. He knows the scheme behind FEPC.

He dares to come before the committee and say "This is the first dose we are going to give you. We have other doses waiting for you when you swallow this one," to get rid of what he considers anti-Communists. It can be seen, from the bunch he represents, what his sentiments are.

I have before me a copy of the CIO News of June 25, 1945.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Did the Senator from Mississippi ever hear of a Catholic Communist?

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does he consider Monsignor Ryan, of the Catholic Church, a Communist?

Mr. BILBO. I do not know the gentleman.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish the Senator would read what he says about the FEPC, from the pamphlet which the Senator has just been reading.

Mr. BILBO. I do not know him, but I do know that there are a few Catholic priests in this country who, along with some Jewish rabbis, are trying to line up with the Negroes in teaching social equality.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would the Senator be willing to submit to the Senate the names of the priests to whom he refers?

Mr. BILBO. I will make a list of them and let the Senator have it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish the Senator would do so.

Mr. BILBO. I believe I have some of the names here, on a petition from Atlanta, Ga.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator may have the names on a petition, but that does not prove that they are Communists. The Senator said they were Communists.

Mr. BILBO. No; I did not say they were Communists. I said they were trying to bring about social equality with the Negro race. Some Baptist preachers, as well as some Methodist preachers, are doing the same thing. I am not reflecting on the Catholics. Some of my best friends are Catholics. I admire them greatly. Down in my home State

there is a Catholic priest of whom I am very fond. I send him a birthday present every year. He is my "pal."

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sure he appreciates it.

Mr. BILBO. But that does not do away with the fact that some of them are rotten, just as some Baptists and some Methodists are rotten. There is something wrong in every organization.

I read from the CIO News of June 25, 1945:

Eighty-one percent of discrimination cases were against Negroes, Ross found, 9 percent against Jews, and 10 percent against foreign-born, mostly Mexicans.

Private industry was responsible for 69.4 percent of the cases; Government agencies, 24.5 percent, and labor unions, 6.1 percent. These labor unions, incidentally, are AFL since the CIO does not permit discrimination.

In other words, the American Federation of Labor is against this measure. That is one of the great labor organizations of the Nation. But the CIO, another great labor organization, is for it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Has the Senator looked at the statement in the hearings from which he was reading, showing the position of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. BILBO. Oh, yes. There are some traitors in the American Federation of Labor; but I am talking about the great body of the American Federation of Labor. They are opposed to this kind of Communist-concept legislation. The CIO is for it. It was the CIO in Washington which staged a famous dance, where Negroes were invited to come and dance with the white daughters of CIO members. So I am not surprised to find the CIO lined up in support of this kind of fool legislation.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of submitting an amendment to the Chavez amendment?

Mr. BILBO. That would take me off the floor. I decline to yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I certainly would not want to take the Senator off the floor.

Mr. BILBO. There will be time for the Senator to offer his amendment when the Senator from New Mexico makes his motion to suspend the rule, and while we are discussing that motion. I think that would be the proper time for the Senator to offer his amendment.

Let us see what my old friend, Westbrook Pegler, says about the FEPC. He is a pretty good authority. I do not always agree with him, but as a rule he is right. This is hot off the bat:

NEW YORK, June 25.—As soon as I can get around to put the bite on John Hartford, the president of the Atlantic & Pacific grocery chain, for a couple of hundred thousand dollars, I am going to start in business with a wonderful idea I had just this very minute. I feel pretty confident that Mr. Hartford will let me have the money because, to me, the idea seems a much better proposition than Elliott Roosevelt's radio thing. And if John figured that Elliott was handicapped in a

business way because his old gent was President of the United States, then his heart ought to bleed for me because my pop is a game warden by trade. You know how everybody hates those guys who come around with a caliper and measure a bass fish that you have just caught by the face and it is a sixteenth of an inch short.

And before you can even throw it back he nabs you, and the judge—he makes a bum of you by saying it is louses like you who make it so nobody can snag a perch or knock off a duck any more, and him with a whole cooler full of illegal fish and birds that the warden grabbed from a lot of poor innocent saps like you for under-size or out-of-season or last year's license and all this and that, and divvied with the honorable court.

Well, like I say, this is a wonderful idea of mine because I have been looking into this antidiscrimination thing—

That is, the FEPC—

where they want a Federal law so if you are running a business—say like a hotel and you want to hire a room clerk and naturally you want one of those good-looking personality types but the first guy to hit you for the job is the oneriest bum you ever laid eyes on and he chews tobacco and picks his teeth with a nail file and he starts off by insulting you, just for a sample of how he is going to treat the guests.

So, of course, you give him the brush and you are just about to interview some nice-looking, well-mannered guy who is reeking with class when the slob that you have just turned down hollers:

"Wait a minute, you dirty rat, because if you don't give me the job I am going to get the antidiscrimination board after you—

That is, the FEPC—

and we will slap you in the booby for about a year and a day and it will cost you \$10,000 even, because I am one of those downtrodden minority muggs and it is against the law to discriminate against me on account of my race, color, religious belief, or country of origin."

"I don't give a damn about your race, color, religious belief, or what country you came from, except I would be glad to pay your way back there," you say to the guy, "and I am discriminating against you because you are a knock against the whole human race—and you don't smell any too fresh."

But, nevertheless, your lawyer says, absolutely, you have got to give him the job, so in about 10 days your hotel is a haunted house and the sheriff takes over.

So this is where my wonderful idea begins to operate and I certainly hope Mr. Hartford will appreciate what a handicap it is to have a game warden for your old man because with a couple of hundred thousand I am confident I could make a million and I will give him quite a slab of stock in the concern and if it should fold up, why I will get my old gent to get some friend or his to buy it back for \$4,000 and he can call it a bad debt and he isn't exaggerating when he says bad.

My idea is to get in a big supply of burnt cork, like Lew Dockstader and Honey Boy Evans used to put on their faces for the old-time minstrel shows, and some good dialect comedians like Moran and Mack for the colored sound effects and maybe Peter Mack for the Jewish and Italian dialects and open up a school where a guy by the name of say, like, for instance, Smith or Jones, he can point a minority and get a job.

Here is where business is going to pick up.

So then if a fellow doesn't happen to belong to any particular minority and his religion is just some ordinary American Sunday-go-to-meeting sect, and he doesn't have any other country of origin except the United

States, why then he can stand an even chance with the minorities.

I think we would have to charge about \$100 a semester for the course but we would have examinations at the end and we would have commencement exercises where the graduates would give demonstrations of their training as they stand under the ceremonial arch with a motto in paper flowers reading something like Beyond the Alps Lies Italy, or The Bay Is Crossed; the Ocean Lies Before.

Like, for instance, a fellow who took the colored course, he would stand up there looking like Eddie Cantor and give an imitation of how he would apply for a job as floor-walker in some swell store and he would say, "Ah sho nuff gotta git me dis flo-walkin' job 'cause ifn. Ah don' get it, yeah bo', Ah sho am gonna call de law and you-all gonna rest yo'se'f in de can, hot diggity dog. What say, bo'?"

The student going out for the Jewish minority would speak about the same piece, excepting he would use Milt Gross' dialect, on which I suppose we might have to pay Milt a little royalty, and lay it on a little thick like this saying, "Oy, gevalt, I vant you should giff me already de job wot I am walking on de floor yat."

I am not so hot on Italian, Polish, Ukrainian, and Macedonian but with all that capital we could hire experts from the OWI when the exodus starts and I am going to beat John Hartford over the ears with the argument that the great majority in the United States are going to need this course in order to join the minorities and get a fair break. Handicapped as I am, through my pop, I will just about break John's heart and I am a dead cinch to walk out with the scratch.

Mr. Pegler has a great idea there and a great scheme. He is going to establish this school which will teach gentiles how to ape members of the minorities which some Senators are trying to take care of in the bill, so that gentiles can get jobs, because, as the law is written, they cannot get jobs. When there is a vacancy, the industrialist or the businessman who does not want to become enmeshed in the toils of the law is afraid to give the job to a white man or to a gentile, I should say, because a Negro or a Jew would come around and would say to him, "You should have given me that job. I want the job, and I am qualified. I have been discriminated against, and I will report you," and then he will start the wheels of the machinery of Government moving, and the poor industrialist will be fined, his business will be hurt, his time will be lost, and hell will break loose generally.

So it is a great scheme. Of course, Pegler is trying to be funny; but it is a great scheme, when the 125,000,000 of the people of the United States who are gentiles will not have a chance under this law to get jobs. But they can take Pegler's course and can learn how to imitate a Negro or how to imitate a Jew or how to imitate a Pole, and then they can get a job, and after they once get the job they need not conceal their true identity any longer.

Here is an editorial which I should like to read. It is entitled "The FEPC and Hell":

THE FEPC AND HELL

The alphabet has assumed major portions in the pattern of the new order, together with seemingly innocent titles, it has passed much damaging legislation. The FEPC means nothing to the average man unless he takes time out to investigate it; then he will run

into another innocent-sounding name for it, "Fair Employment Practice Commission." Nothing wrong with that. Who doesn't want to be fair? That, of course, is as it was designed, catchy, implying one thing while meaning entirely to the contrary. The only chance we have to find the nigger in the wood pile is to look for him.

There's nothing fair about the bill nor the practice. It was designed with a twofold purpose; to entice the Negro vote, and to appease the Communist elements that are operating within the Nation.

No white gentile American can support the measure with any degree of honor. If the FEPC is made permanent, these United States will then have a mandate for the second revolutionary war.—The Southern Outlook.

There is a lot of sense in that editorial.

Mr. President, last night I received a letter which I should like to read at this time. It comes from Kansas City:

JUNE 25, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR BILBO: FEPC is an iniquitous institution, and I am surprised that President Truman favors it. I hope he does not ape Roosevelt.

FEPC is one of the symptoms of national disorder; it is a frontal assault upon the decent social order which has existed in America since it was founded; it menaces the foundations of this Republic; it is the weapon of "red" fascism.

FEPC is part of a movement which threatens gentile white preservation.

I am proud that you have the courage to fight FEPC and resist the tremendous pressure which is being put on legislative representatives.

FEPC is an atrocious evil which assaults the social principles which have made our country great. In fighting it you exhibit the courage which one must have in this terrible time.

God bless you Senator. More power to you. Sincerely,

That is from Kansas City. I wish I had had time to communicate with the writer of the letter, to get his permission to have his name printed in the RECORD, but unfortunately I have not had time to do so. Therefore, I ask the reporter not to have his name printed.

Here is a letter from good old Mississippi, from one of the leading businessmen in the State:

HOWISON (FOREST LODGE), MISS.,

June 23, 1945.

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO,
Senior Senator From Mississippi,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Just noticed in yesterday's press how some Atlanta (Ga.) Baptist preacher lambasted you for your remarks with reference to the class of folks in Atlanta who signed the petition to Congress asking that the Fair Employment Practices Act be made permanent. I am writing you simply to state that I fully concur with you in any adjective you see fit to apply to those signers in Atlanta or to similar signers in any other portion of this Nation, and for the reason that I am unable to see how any sane, sensible white man in this country, either in the South or in the North, can be in favor of such legislation. It is, of course, easy for any man to get signers to any type of petition. It is my belief that if the opponents in Congress to this monstrosity of a measure could get before the American people its real meaning and the demoralizing results that would come from it, the advocates would vanish. For the Lord's sake, what in the name of God is this country coming to, anyway. All three of my sons are in the service, but if they are fighting and sacrificing for the type of freedom and type

of life as it appears now we are doomed for, then I wish I could call them all home, as I feel they are fighting for a lost cause.

Very sincerely yours,

P. N. HOWELL.

To my mind, this good citizen has the right slant on the whole picture. If we do not put a stop to all these so-called liberal Communist ideas of a republican and democratic form of government, we will be headed for trouble.

Here is another letter from Atlanta, Ga.:

Senator BILBO, OF MISSISSIPPI,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Your very recent statement in a letter to a certain Atlanta clique regarding the FEPC pending legislation, is the whole truth and nothing but the truth and you are to be commended and supported by every true America-loving citizen. The fact is, you did not state the condition existing in Atlanta half strong enough. The truth is, Senator, Atlanta is a hotbed of communistic-minded people in high places. It is permeating the atmosphere of our churches, colleges, and schools, and the Government bureaus are saturated with it. This condition, as you well know, exists in every State, county, city, and village in the United States and if you red-blooded Americans in the Congress let legislation like the FEPC be enacted into the laws of the land, then I say, God pity us as a nation.

Yours truly,

Mr. President, I now read an editorial from the Mobile Register, which is one of the influential papers of the South. The title of the editorial is "Prospective New Move for More FEPC Funds Should Be Defeated." I will read it because the editor has made a very strong argument which should convince any doubting Thomas.

I read:

When the Senate takes up the war agencies appropriation bill this week a fight apparently is going to be made on the floor to add an appropriation for the so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee. The Senate will serve the interests of domestic harmony if it defeats the maneuver.

The legislative picture on the FEPC is quite complicated. The agency has never been authorized by Congress but was created by an Executive order of President Roosevelt on June 21, 1941, then recreated by another Executive order of May 23, 1943.

Last year Congress inserted a provision in the independent offices appropriation bill by which no appropriation may be used to pay the expenses of any agency after it has been in existence for more than a year, unless Congress specifically appropriates money for it or has authorized it to expend funds. That means the end of the FEPC after this fiscal year unless Congress puts more money in its hands, which Congress should not do.

In other words, this writer is trying to get over the idea that at midnight next Saturday the FEPC will be dead, and will be ready for interment. I would be very glad to serve as a pallbearer.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question. Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If the Senator's status will not be changed, I ask him to yield to me in order that I

may move that the pending bill be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill (H. R. 3550), the War Department appropriation bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the Senator from Oklahoma a question. Is the bill to which the Senator from Oklahoma refers the war appropriation bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes. It provides for funds for the military establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the bill contain any items which would be controversial?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. There are five or six amendments which were unanimously agreed to by the subcommittee, and by the main committee as well. The bill was reported unanimously to the Senate by the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So far as the pending business is concerned, I have no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3550, making appropriations for the Military Establishment.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3550), making appropriations for the military establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, before the amendments are taken up I desire to submit for the Record a very brief explanation of the bill. In order to save the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

As passed by the House of Representatives, H. R. 3550 provides total available funds during the fiscal year 1946 of \$38,500,285,951 for military activities of the War Department. However, unanticipated increases in construction requirements have forced the War Department to request an increase of \$120,618,630 for this purpose and this increase has been approved and incorporated in the Senate bill.

The total amount is made up of two parts. Prior year funds in the sum of \$17,124,002,551 were reappropriated. This represents the unobligated balance or carry-over, as well as the anticipated recoveries to be made as a result of deobligation of funds after July 1. The sum of \$21,496,902,030 in new money is appropriated, and the total of new money and reappropriated funds is \$38,620,904,581.

For the sake of comparison, I wish to show here the amount of new money and reappropriated funds provided by Congress each

year since 1942 and the proposed amounts recommended in the present bill.

Year	New money	Reappropriated	Total funds
1942...	\$75,462,593,587	-----	\$75,462,593,587
1943...	42,820,006,365	\$32,100,556,877	74,920,563,242
1944...	49,034,839,673	15,176,410,288	74,211,249,961
1945...	15,434,814,795	32,757,963,469	48,192,778,264
1946...	21,496,902,030	17,124,002,551	38,620,904,581

Not only has there been an over-all decrease in the dollar requirements of the War Department amounting to more than 20 percent, when compared with the current program, but the emphasis has shifted as regards the elements of this program. Formerly the fund requirements for supplies and equipment represented the major part of the War Department program. For 1946 this element is reduced to only 54 percent of the 1945 requirement and, for the first time, purchase of supplies and equipment will represent less than half of the total fund requirements.

On the other hand, funds required for pay and travel of the Army show an increase. This is due to the fact that the planned decrease in strength of the Army from an average of 8,100,000 to 7,700,000 is more than offset by mustering-out payments increased longevity pay and increased travel. It is estimated that 2,067,432 officers and enlisted men will be entitled to mustering-out payments, ranging from \$100 to \$300. The increased travel in the United States is due to the redeployment of our troops.

In general, then, it may be said that those items like pay, subsistence, clothing, etc., which relate directly to the strength of the Army, show minor changes from the current year, while procurement of equipment and supplies, such as planes, tanks, guns, and ammunition, carry drastic reductions. The termination of hostilities in Europe has made it possible to substantially reduce outstanding orders for a wide range of equipment, thereby effecting extensive savings and reductions in obligations.

A further reduction is made possible through completion of the industrial facilities expansion program of the War Department. Production capacity is now adequate to meet present requirements and no additional plants are contemplated, except as required to produce newly developed items for which existing facilities are unsuitable or inadequate.

In considering the plans of the Army for the coming year as they affect fund requirements, the following points should be stressed. The paramount aim is the defeat of Japan as quickly as possible. A quick victory will save American lives and is economical of matériel and national war effort. It will also impress the result most forcibly on the Japanese. It is the desire of the War Department to bring back through the United States, with a 30-day furlough home en route, the maximum number of soldiers consistent with this paramount aim of swift and powerful operations in the far Pacific. It is also the desire of the Army to demobilize, under its point system, men who have earned the right to discharge at the maximum rate permitted by redeployment operations. It is estimated that an average discharge rate of 167,000 per month can be attained.

The program contemplated that a division redeployed from Europe to the Pacific will practically dissolve upon reaching the United States east-coast port, whence solid train loads of soldiers will move within 24 hours to distribution points nearest their homes. From there the soldiers go as individuals to their homes, returning after completion of the 30-day leave to the distribution point.